

Unauthorized disclosure of information  
may constitute an invasion of personal privacy.



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

PHOTOCOPY



DA

JAN 11 2009

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date:

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]  
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the  
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The service center director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed. The petition will be denied.

The petitioner is an employee leasing services company that seeks to employ the beneficiary as an accountant. The petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

The director denied the petition because the proffered position is not a specialty occupation. On appeal, the petitioner submits a letter.

Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), defines the term "specialty occupation" as an occupation that requires:

- (A) theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and
- (B) attainment of a bachelor's or higher degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent) as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), to qualify as a specialty occupation, the position must meet one of the following criteria:

- (1) A baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position;
- (2) The degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations or, in the alternative, an employer may show that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree;
- (3) The employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position; or
- (4) The nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) interprets the term "degree" in the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to mean not just any baccalaureate or higher degree, but one in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proffered position.

The record of proceeding before the AAO contains: (1) Form I-129 and supporting documentation; (2) the director's request for additional evidence; (3) the petitioner's response to the director's request; (4) the director's denial letter; and (5) Form I-290B and supporting documentation. The AAO reviewed the record in its entirety before issuing its decision.

The petitioner is seeking the beneficiary's services as an accountant. Evidence of the beneficiary's duties includes: the I-129 petition; the petitioner's February 26, 2003 letter in support of the petition; and the petitioner's response to the director's request for evidence. According to this evidence, the beneficiary would perform duties that entail: preparing weekly and monthly reports, processing and balancing wire transfers; preparing month-end journal entries for various accounts to include bank analysis and reconciliation; coordinating annual 1099 reporting process; and utilizing negotiation skills to develop payment and assisting with monthly corporate departmental expense analysis. The petitioner indicated that a qualified candidate for the job would possess a bachelor's degree in accounting.

The director found that the proffered position was not a specialty occupation because it is not an accounting position; it is a bookkeeper position.

On appeal, the petitioner states that the supervisory duties of the proffered position require a person with a college degree. The petitioner also states that some of the duties of an accountant may also be those of a bookkeeper, and that while an accountant can perform a bookkeeper's duties, a bookkeeper cannot perform the duties of an accountant. The petitioner asserts that its client specifically requested a worker with a bachelor's degree in accounting, and included that request in its service agreement with the petitioner. Finally, the petitioner states that it was unaware that the director requested a number of the documents that he determined were missing from its response to the request for evidence.

The AAO notes that an accountant is generally considered to be a specialty occupation. The issue to be resolved is whether the proffered position is actually that of an accountant.

Upon review of the record, the petitioner has established none of the four criteria outlined in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A). Therefore, the proffered position is not a specialty occupation.

The AAO turns first to the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) and (2): a baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is the normal minimum requirement for entry into the particular position; a degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations; or a particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree.

Factors often considered by CIS when determining these criteria include: whether the Department of Labor's *Occupational Outlook Handbook (Handbook)* reports that the industry requires a degree; whether the industry's professional association has made a degree a minimum entry requirement; and whether letters or affidavits from firms or individuals in the industry attest that such firms "routinely employ and recruit only degreed individuals." See *Shanti, Inc. v. Reno*, 36 F. Supp. 2d 1151, 1165 (D.Minn. 1999)(quoting *Hird/Blaker Corp. v. Sava*, 712 F. Supp. 1095, 1102 (S.D.N.Y. 1989)).

The AAO routinely consults the *Handbook* for its information about the duties and educational requirements of particular occupations. While the petitioner called the position an accountant, the few duties listed are not those of an accountant. CIS looks beyond the title of the position and determines, from a review of the duties of the position and any supporting evidence, whether the position actually requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and the attainment of a baccalaureate degree

in a specific specialty as the minimum for entry into the occupation as required by the Act. CIS must be satisfied that the ultimate employment of the alien is in a specialty occupation, regardless of the position's title. All of the duties of the proffered position parallel the bookkeeper or accounting clerk job descriptions in the *Handbook*. No evidence in the *Handbook* indicates that a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, is required for a bookkeeper or accounting clerk.

There is no evidence in the record regarding parallel positions in the petitioner's industry. The record also does not include any evidence from professional associations regarding an industry standard, or documentation to support the complexity or uniqueness of the proffered position. The petitioner has, thus, not established the criteria set forth at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1) or (2).

The AAO now turns to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3) – the employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position. There is no evidence in the record regarding the petitioner's client's past hiring practices. In *Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F. 3d 384 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000), the court held that the Immigration and Naturalization Service, now CIS, reasonably interpreted the statute and the regulations when it required the petitioner to show that the entities ultimately employing the foreign nurses require a bachelor's degree for all employees in that position. The court found that the degree requirement should not originate with the employment agency that brought the nurses to the United States for employment with the agency's clients. On appeal, the petitioner states, "[A]s mentioned on our response to the RFE, our client . . . in its service request specifically requested for a worker with college degree in accounting and made mention of this essential need due to the managerial responsibilities that includes crucial decision making to be made on behalf of the company." There is nothing in the staffing service agreement that the petitioner submitted that references any of this information, and no other information in the record supports this statement. Going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. *Matter of Soffici*, 22 I&N Dec. 158, 165 (Comm. 1998) (citing *Matter of Treasure Craft of California*, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972)).

Finally, the AAO turns to the criterion at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4) – the nature of the specific duties is so specialized and complex that knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

To the extent that they are depicted in the record, the duties do not appear so specialized and complex as to require the highly specialized knowledge associated with a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty. Therefore, the evidence does not establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4).

As related in the discussion above, the petitioner has failed to establish that the proffered position is a specialty occupation. Accordingly, the AAO shall not disturb the director's denial of the petition.

The AAO notes that the director referred to a number of documents requested in his request for evidence that the petitioner failed to provide. On appeal, the petitioner provided a copy of the request for evidence that it received, which appears to have been missing at least one page. Nonetheless, the director did not base his decision on the missing documents, but rather noted that they were not supplied in the petitioner's response.

Failure to provide the documentation is not prejudicial. The director requested the position announcement, the petitioner's organizational chart, the petitioner's federal income tax statement, and the beneficiary's original baccalaureate diploma. The petitioner had the opportunity to submit these documents on appeal, but did not. These documents, however, are not critical to the determination of whether the proffered position is a specialty occupation. Since the director's decision did not turn on whether the documents had been provided or not, their absence from the record is not an element of the AAO's decision either.

An H-1B alien is coming temporarily to the United States to perform services in a specialty occupation. Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b). 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(1)(ii)(B). The petitioner claims that it will employ the beneficiary as an accountant, but it has not proved that the beneficiary will be coming to the United States to perform services as an accountant.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed. The petition is denied.